## OPINION 734

### *NAIADITES ANGULATUS* DAWSON, 1860 (LAMELLIBRANCHIA): INTERPRETED IN ACCORDANCE WITH ACCUSTOMED USAGE

**RULING.**—(1) It is hereby Ruled that the nominal species *Naiadites angulatus* Dawson, 1860, is to be interpreted by reference to the specimen No. 3132 in the Redpath Museum, Montreal, Canada.

(2) The specific name *angulatus* Dawson, 1860, as published in the binomen *Naiadites angulatus* (as interpreted by the Ruling given in (1) above) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2078.

### HISTORY OF THE CASE (Z.N.(S.) 1525)

The present case was submitted to the office of the Commission in March 1962 by Mrs. J. Rogers. Mrs. Rogers' application was sent to the printer on 9 March 1962 and was published on 11 April 1963 in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **20** : 153–154. Public Notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the present case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the other prescribed serial publications (Constitution Art. 12b; *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **21** : 184). The proposals were supported by Dr. J. Weir (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **20** : 155), Dr. R. M. C. Eager (*op. cit.*: 156), Dr. R. B. Wilson, Dr. A. Pastiels and Dr. Eva Paproth.

### DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 5 October 1964 the Members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (64)23 either for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **20** : 154. At the close of the prescribed voting period on 5 January 1965 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative votes—twenty-four (24), received in the following order: China, Holthuis, Lemche, Mayr, Brinck, Jaczewski, Vokes, Riley, Obruchev, do Amaral, Simpson, Boschma, Tortonese, Bonnet, Evans, Ride, Binder, Uchida, Miller, Mertens, Forest, Alvarado, Borchsenius, Stoll.

Negative votes—two (2): Sabrosky, Kraus.

Voting Papers not returned—two (2): Hubbs, Munroe.

The following comments were made by Commissioners in returning their votes:

*Dr. L. B. Holthuis* (12.x.64): I do not see why the specimen in question (R.M. No. 3132) should not be made a neotype, because that is what the action asked by Mrs. Rogers of the Commission actually amounts to.

*Prof. G. G. Simpson* (4.xii.64): I vote " for " because the intention is clearly good. The wording of the proposal nevertheless seems inadequate or ambiguous. What does " interpreted by reference to " mean in terms of the Code?

*Mr. C. W. Sabrosky* (23.xii.64): The Commission would unduly intrude into zoology to rule on this case. I see no need for an Opinion. Accustomed usage can be continued, and *Naiadites angulatus* Dawson can be interpreted as it has been, particularly by reference to Redpath Museum specimen 3132.

*Dr. Otto Kraus* (7.i.65): For reasons of principle I cannot vote for the proposed interpretation of a nominal species by reference to a specimen which is not a [lecto-]type and is not a neotype.

### Original Reference

The following is the original reference for the name placed on the Official List of Specific Names by the Ruling given in the present Opinion:
*angulatus*, *Naiadites*, Dawson, 1860, *Supplement to* " *Acadian Geology* ": 45.

## CERTIFICATE

We certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (64)23 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that Voting Paper has been duly adopted, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 734.

G. OWEN EVANS
*Honorary Secretary*

W. E. CHINA
*Assistant Secretary*

*International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*
*London*
16 *February* 1965